

**REMARKS:**

In response to the Office Action mailed May 15, 2006, an Amendment was filed on August 15, 2006. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on August 29, 2006.

For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments (claims 1, 7, 15, 19 and 23-25) and arguments presented in the August 15, 2006 Amendment are reiterated herein. Further, new claim 26 is added. Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 15, 19 and 23-25 are amended and claim 26 is added. Claims 5, 6, 17, 18, 21 and 22 are cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-4, 7-16, 19, 20 and 23-26 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,935,210 (Stark), U.S. Patent No. 6,011,537 (Slotznick) and U.S. Patent No. 6,148,334 (Imai).

The resource map in Stark is a graphical representation of the hyperlink structure of the site (40) and information (meta-data) characterizing each of the resources in the site (40)(see, Fig. 3 and corresponding text). The resource map of Stark simply presents the site (40) as a tree having as a root node information characterizing a current home page (42) and several branch nodes hierarchically subordinate to the root node (see, col. 4, line 67-col.5, line 27 and col. 8, lines 12-27). For example, when a certain site A is browsed, the resource constituting the screen is stored in relation to the site A and when the site A is browsed currently, a search is made to determine what resource is required to constitute a screen for the current site A by taking the difference from the stored data so that only a newly required data is downloaded.

Slotznick is directed to displaying cached information (secondary information) during a delay time occurring during retrieval of subsequent primary information (see, col. 9, lines 22-39 and col. 20, lines 58-64). For example, while viewing the primary data in Fig. 4, clicking on the image of the man's face or the words "the dunes" displays the screen in FIG. 5, which remains displayed until subsequent primary information is selected by the user.

On the other hand, Imai transfers files from a file server to a client device requesting the file where the transfer includes sending a list of files related to the desired file indicated by the request to the client device (see, col. 2, line 62 through col. 3, line 5).

The claimed invention reads an arbitrarily selected file in advance when a predetermined period of time lapses without a screen manipulation (e.g., idle time has reached a predetermined time). The claimed system and method also executes advance reading of the file when a period of time lapses while a cursor has stayed in a certain region (e.g., cursor may be moving slightly but has stayed within a certain link area). As such, the claimed invention reads contents without requiring information relating to a resource constituting a previous screen.

Independent claim 1 recites, “analyzing a display control file to extract another file described or created by a script or a program in a resource file” and “specifying said another file to temporarily store a URL created by said script or said program.” Claim 1 further recites, “downloading another file based on said URL according to a predetermined condition”, “monitoring if no operation on the display has been performed during a certain period and/or a coordinate designated has stayed within a certain area of said display screen during a certain period of time” including “loading said another file onto an invisible screen prior to designation of said another file on the display screen.” The file is loaded into the invisible screen is displayed “without downloading said another file when said another file in the display control file is designated on the display screen.” Independent claims 15 and 19 recite similar features.

Claims 23 and 24 also recite that the file “described or created by a script or a program in a resource file” is “downloaded based on a predetermined condition prior to designation of the file on the display screen” and is “displayed onto the display screen when the file is designated on the display screen.” Claims 23 and 24 further recite that “the predetermined condition is based on a determination that an operation has not been performed during a period of time or a designated coordinate has stayed within a certain area of said display screen during the period of time.”

Similarly, independent claim 25 recites, “analyzing a source page content of a web page and extracting a URL identified in the web page prior to designation of the URL.” Accordingly, the claimed method “temporarily” loads the URL in “an invisible screen when an operation has not been performed during a period of time or a designated coordinate has stayed within a certain area of said display screen during the period of time” and displays contents of the URL onto a display screen when the URL is designated.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also

independently patentable. For example, claim 14 that the present invention "the change in the display on the display screen comprises a visual change of coordinate designation means displayed on the display screen." The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claims 14.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM:**

New claim 26 has been added to recite, "downloading a second file in an invisible screen upon determining **a link to the second file contained in a first file** displayed meets a predefined condition" and "**displaying the downloaded second file** via the network browser responsive to a request by a user to display the second file" (emphasis added).

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, "downloading a second file in an invisible screen" and "displaying the downloaded second file responsive to a request by a user to display the second file", as recited in new claim 26.

It is submitted that new claim 26 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 09/12/2006

By:   
Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501